DECEMBER 1956

The Reformed Journal

A PERIODICAL OF REFORMED COMMENT AND OPINION

S.F.T.S
LIBRARY

Hospitality

By HENRY ZYLSTRA

Abraham Saw the Day of Christ

By JOHN WEIDENAAR

Heritage and Destiny

By M. EUGENE OSTERHAVEN

Pages From the Past

THE EDITORS

Book Reviews by

MILLAR BURROWS, GEORGE HARPER, ARTHUR OTTEN

LORD,

thou hast been our dwelling place
In all generations.
Before the mountains were brought forth,
Or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world,
Even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God.
Thou turnest man to destruction,
And sayest, Return, ye children of men.
For a thousand years in thy sight
Are but as yesterday when it is past,
And as a watch in the night.
Thou carriest them away as with a flood; they are as a sleep:
In the morning they are like grass which groweth up.
In the morning it flourisheth, and groweth up;
In the evening it is cut down, and withereth.
For we are consumed in thine anger,
And in thy wrath are we troubled.
Thou hast set our iniquities before thee,
Our secret sins in the light of thy countenance.
For all our days are passed away in thy wrath:
We bring our years to an end as a sigh.
The days of our years are three score years and ten,
Or even if by reason of strength four-score years;
Yet is their pride but labor and sorrow;
For it is soon gone, and we fly away.
Who knoweth the power of thine anger,
And thy wrath according to the fear that is due unto thee?
So teach us to number our days,
That we may get us a heart of wisdom.
Return, O Jehovah; how long?
And let it repent thee concerning thy servants.
Oh, satisfy us in the morning with thy lovingkindness,
That we may rejoice and be glad all our days.
Make us glad according to the days wherein thou hast afflicted us,
And the years wherein we have seen evil.
Let thy work appear unto thy servants,
And thy glory upon their children.
And let the favor of the Lord our God be upon us;
And establish thou the work of our hands upon us;
Yea, the work of our hands establish thou it.

Psalm 90

The Reformed Journa

A PERIODICAL OF REFORMED COMMENT & OPINIO

VOLUME VI No.

DECEMBER 1956

Editorial Board

HARRY R. BOER, JAMES DAANE, GEORGE STOB
HENRY STOB, HENRY ZYLSTRA

Publisher

William B. Eerdmans, Sr.

HOSPITALITY
Dr. Henry Zylstra, *Late Professor of English Language and Literature, Calvin College*

WHEN ABRAHAM SAW THE DAY OF CHRIST
Rev. John Weidenaar, *Associate Professor of Bible, Calvin College*

HERITAGE AND DESTINY
Dr. M. Eugene Osterhaven, *Professor of Systematic Theology, Western Theological Seminary, Holland, Michigan*

PAGES FROM THE PAST
Edited by Dr. George Stob, *Minister of the Prospect Street Christian Reformed Church, Passaic, New Jersey*

BOOK REVIEWS

LETTERS TO THE JOURNAL

INDEXES TO VOLUME VI

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, excepting August, by the Wm. B. Eerdmans lishing Company, at 231 Jefferson Avenue, S.E., Grand Rapids 3, Michi Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Grand Rapids, Michi

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: 25c per copy; $2.50 one year; $4.00 two y

ADDRESS all subscriptions to Subscription Department, *The Refo Journal*, 231 Jefferson Avenue, S. E., Grand Rapids 3, Michigan. Ad all editorial and advertising communications to Managing Editor and A tising Manager respectively.

Managing Editor: Calvin P. Bulthuis; Advertising Manager: David Wyn

HENRY ZYLSTRA 1909-1956

On Sunday, December 2, Henry Zylstra died of a heart attack at the age of 47. He was struck down suddenly and unexpectedly while standing on a street corner, his wife at his side. It happened far from home, while he was on leave from Calvin College fulfilling a one-year appointment as Senior Lecturer in English and American Literature at the Free University of Amsterdam. Memorial services were held in Amsterdam on December 4 and at Calvin College on December 7. Funeral services were conducted in the LaGrave Avenue Christian Reformed Church on Monday, December 10. The body lies buried in Woodlawn Cemetery, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Henry Zylstra helped found The Reformed Journal, *and as one of its editors he not only contributed regularly to its pages but he shared in giving our venture character and direction. We shall miss him sorely. We have lost a friend whose heart had become intertwined with ours, and we have lost an associate whose extraordinary qualities of mind and heart fitted him for great and noble work.*

To the sorrowing widow and children, and to the other members of his family, the Journal *extends its deepest sympathy and its heartfelt Christian condolences.*

The Editors

Hospitality*

by Henry Zylstra

. . . There was no room . . . in the inn. —ST. LUKE

Come, Thou long expected Jesus,
Born to set Thy people free;
From our fears and sins release us;
Let us find our rest in Thee.
Israel's strength and consolation,
Hope of all the earth Thou art;
Dear desire of every nation,
Joy of every longing heart.

—CHARLES WESLEY

AMONG the older American Christmas classics, none is more charming than Irving's inimitable *Sketch Book.* I was reading those five Christmas chapters in that book again a while ago, and I found myself longing for the ingratiating warmth and liberality in the manor houses of yesteryear. The thing that comes to grand expression in Irving's sketches is the old time Christmas virtue of *hospitality.* Said the old Squire of Bracebridge Hall: "I love to see this day well kept by rich and poor; it is a great thing to have one day in the year, at least, when you are sure of being welcome wherever you go, and of having, as it were, the world all thrown open to you."

It is quite right that this virtue or grace of hospitality should be so firmly associated for us with Christmas. The association is a natural one. Two of the things, certainly, that make for hospitality are the *guest* and the *gift.* Both of these were uniquely present at Christmas. St. Benedict set it down as a rule of his order: "Every guest who comes to the monastery shall be received as if he were Christ Himself." Such, surely, is the basis of the generosity and love we show *our* guests at Christmas, and such, rightly taken, is the foundation of all Christmas hospitality whatever.

Time was when the very word *guest* quickened the pulses and set up a high expectancy. One sees eager children, wistful at the window pane, awaiting the cutter's arrival. It may be that we have lost something of the keen edge of this expectation in the humdrum of our secularized lives. But time was when distances were long, travel was hard, and visits were a privilege. It was then that the host appreciated the guest, and the guest the host. And if we have lost the fine edge of expectation in our regimented holiday procedures, this may also be because not everything is in order with our chari One of our American poets, Mr. Auden, at lea writes of clearing up the debris after a trying h day:

. . . Now we must dismantle the tree
Putting the decorations back into their cardboard boxes —
Some have got broken — and carrying them back to the attic.
. . . There are enough
Left-overs to do, warmed-up, for the rest of the week —
Not that we have much appetite, having drunk such a lot,
Stayed up so late, attempted — quite unsuccessfully —
To love all our relatives, and in general
Grossly overestimated our powers.

We ought all, of course, in this Christmas sea to be those children at the window impatiently a ing again and again, "Is He coming?" And if e there ought to have been an excitement of expec tion it was when, in the fulness of time, proph yearned for fulfillment in the coming of the Div guest. This was He who was announced in E as the One that should bruise the serpent's h The procession of the prophets marched towa Bethlehem from Balaam to Malachi with a mou ing crescendo of urgency. The whole past was c verging upon this present. This was the Bran the Root, the Stem. Micah had been very speci "Thou Bethlehem Ephrata, though thou be li among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee s he come forth that is to be ruler of Israel." there is no need here for calling upon the prop for further witness: the words of Handel's *Mess* are ringing in our ears. The point is clear: Lord ought to have been an *expected* guest.

BUT what now of the hospitality, the welc the entertainment He received? Think ag of Washington Irving's words: Christmas the day on which we can be sure of being welcome a where, and of having, as it were, the world thrown open to us. The world, all the world, most certainly our Lord's due. "All things are livered to me," He said. "God," wrote the au of the Book of Hebrews, "hath in these last c spoken unto us by his Son whom he hath appoi heir of all things." Long ago, in the Book of G esis, the father Jacob had sent his son Josep his own, and they had said, "This is the heir:

* This piece appeared in the December 1955 issue of the *Journal* and is here reprinted in order to bring to the reader Henry Zylstra's last published reflections upon the nativity of our Lord.

s kill him." Our Lord explained it in a parable: Surely they will reverence the Son." But they id not accord Him this welcome. They put Him o death.

Joseph and Mary came to the inn, and they were aved away. Such was the Christmas Eve hospiality accorded the Heir of all things, Him to whom ne world should have been all thrown open. Later le would give some hint of His natural right to the nings that were refused Him, as when He sent His isciples for the colt on which to ride triumphantly nto Jerusalem. If they were prevented from loosng the animal, those disciples were simply to say: The Lord hath need of him." But this hour was ot now come. There was no room at the inn.

We need not, at this late date, be berating the esk clerk in that old Palestinian hotel for his lack f respect. The natural man, of whom there is much n us all, does not easily recognize spiritual things. he poor man did not guess that eternity might have npinged upon time in the guestbook of his estabshment. He did not know, as a poet would put it ter, that twenty centuries of stony sleep were bout to be vexed to nightmare by a rocking cradle. le may have come with our best world's wisdom, nd mumbled something about First come, first erved.

First come, first served indeed. This was the lpha, and He should have been served first. But here was no room. So it was that our earth reeived its honored guest. Afterwards, on occasion, is true, He found hospitality in that friendly cotage in Bethany. But that was an oasis in the desert f general neglect. "Foxes," He said, "have holes, nd the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of nan hath not where to lay his head." The expected guest was a *rejected* guest. He came to His own and His own received Him not.

OBVIOUSLY, our own Christmas hospitality will be merely sentimental unless we begin by opening the homes of our hearts to this royal guest ourselves. Someone wrote a verse about that:

They said the Master is coming
To honor the town today;
And none can tell at whose house or home
The master will choose to stay.
And I thought while my heart beat wildly,
What if he should come to mine,
How would I strive to entertain,
And honor the guest Divine?

Joyce Kilmer put it this way:

Unlock your door this evening,
And let your gate swing wide;
Let him who asks for shelter,
Come speedily inside.
What if your yard be narrow,
What if your house be small:
There is a guest is coming
Will glorify it all.

Consider, finally, the words of our Lord: *Behold, I stand at the door and knock. If any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him and sup with him, and he with me.* That is the penultimate word on hospitality. May we pray for the grace to receive Him into the homes of our hearts. May we praise Him for the great grace of condescending to us, entering into us, and lodging with us. May we unbar the gates of our pride, and kindle within the hearths of our souls a love that can respond to His own. May He himself prepare within us a table of offerings acceptable to Him. And may He dine with us now and evermore.

A Child My Choice

Let folly praise that fancy loves, I praise and love that Child
Whose heart no thought, Whose tongue no word, Whose hand no deed defiled.
I praise Him most, I love Him best, all praise and love is His;
While Him I love, in Him I live, and cannot live amiss.
Love's sweetest mark, laud's highest theme, man's most desired light,
To love Him life, to leave Him death, to live in Him delight.
He mine by gift, I His by debt, thus each to other due,
First friend He was, best friend He is, all times will try Him true.

Though young, yet wise, though small, yet strong; though man, yet God He is;
As wise He knows, as strong He can, as God He loves to bliss.
His knowledge rules, His strength defends, His love doth cherish all;
His birth our joy, His life our light, His death our end of thrall.
Alas! He weeps, He sighs, He pants, yet do His angels sing;
Out of His tears, His sighs and throbs, doth bud a joyful spring.
Almighty Babe, Whose tender arms can force all foes to fly,
Correct my faults, protect my life, direct me when I die!

—ROBERT SOUTHWELL, c. 1561-1595

When Abraham Saw the Day of Christ

by John Weidenaar

WHEN PAUL wrote the Gospel in Romans 8 in the words, "He that spared not his own Son but delivered him up for us all," he was doubtless thinking of the word of the angel of Jehovah who said to Abraham: "Lay not thy hand upon the lad, neither do thou anything unto him, for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from me" (Genesis 22:12). And when Jesus was speaking to the hostile Jews who boasted of their descent from Abraham, he declared: "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it and was glad." In derision they retorted that Jesus was not even fifty years old and therefore could never have seen Abraham. But Jesus replied: "Verily, verily, I say unto you: before Abraham was born, I am." And they picked up stones to throw at him.

THE dramatic story of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac on Mount Moriah is calculated to shock the sensibilities of everyone who reads it. It appears at the time of the sharpest possible period of particularization in the Old Testament about two thousand years before the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem. In the land of Canaan whither Abraham had gone at the behest of Jehovah, human sacrifices were offered. A contributor to a Bible commentary still in the process of being written declares:

> Here is a chapter of the O. T. which shows the need of reading with discretion and discrimination. There is truth before which one will stand with reverence; but there are vestiges also of old ideas which the developing conscience has long since outgrown . . . . Here in the story of Abraham and Isaac there is imbedded the fact that once men not only practiced human sacrifice, but did it at what they thought was divine command. Suppose they did that now? Any man who thought of it, if his thoughts were detected, would be put in a mental hospital. Any man who actually carried it out would be convicted of murder and executed. So the story of Abraham going out to sacrifice Isaac may seem either incredible or else profoundly disturbing to children in Sunday school or to adults who hear it read in church, unless they know what to sift out of it in order that the real truth may appear.

The key to the story is found in reading it whole and in giving due weight to every part of it without diminution or apology. The moral problem is not lessened but compounded a hundredfold when one remembers that the idea did not emerge in the mind of Abraham as though he felt he should do as much for his god as his fellow Canaanites did for their gods. It was not Abraham but God, the true God, who commanded Abraham to offer his son as a burnt offering! To tone down even o part of the biblical report is to miss the point issue and to lose the Gospel.

WHY did God subject Abraham to such a sev testing and why did God lead him on till held the knife poised in his hand to slay his so Nothing less would do because Abraham stood the point of the sharpest particularization in Old Testament, that he might become a blessing all the nations of the earth. The nations of earth are all the sons of God, but Israel was firstborn son and had to show the way. If Isr were to show the way it had to know the way, only way, in which mankind could share in blessings of God's grace. How could Israel t thousand years before Christmas get the messa God knew the answer. Thus he set up Abraha placed him on Mount Moriah, and put a knife his hands as the most spectacular, dramatic, a unforgettable proclamation of the absolute necess of the atonement. Without the shedding of bl there is no remission of sins! There was no bet way to imprint indelibly upon the generations come down through the centuries this one ind pensable fact.

Blood is important, but not any kind of blo Atonement is needed, but not any kind that m may devise or invent, if man is to get right w God. And therefore God added to his previ revelations to Abraham, the supreme manifes tion of the angel of Jehovah who at the crit juncture forbade the slaying of Isaac. In doing he forever rejected every effort to obtain atonem through human sacrifice. To be sure, Isaac w spared, but he was also rejected because there w none other good enough to pay the price of sin

But why the angel? It was God who comma ed Abraham to offer Isaac, but it is the angel Jehovah who stopped him from doing it. T angel distinguishes himself from God when he sa Do not harm the lad for now I know that t fearest God. At the same moment he identi himself with God when he continues to say, T hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from Thus the angel of Jehovah is the pre-incarnate, Christmas manifestation of the Son of God, Savior of mankind. And the ram, not Isaac, comes the type: first, the type of all the ani sacrifices intended to teach Israel the need of blo

ieology; and next, the type of the lamb of God that ketb away the sin of the world.

It was a different Abraham and a new Isaac that returned to Beersheba. The angel had et them and they had seen the face of God on the ount. The angel returned to heaven, in the ılness of time re-appeared in Bethlehem, entered ıe garden of Gethsemane, climbed the hill of rulls laden with the cross, and bore the wrath of od against the sin of mankind. When Isaac had sked of Abraham, Where is the lamb?, Abraham had answered, Jehovah-jireh, that is, the Lord will provide *himself* the lamb for the burnt-offering. When God the Father answered his Son in the crisis of all crisis, he said to him: Depart from me, I never knew you; which being interpreted is: "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?"

What can we say in the face of all these things? We say with Paul: He that spared not his own son but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him give us all things for today and tomorrow!

Heritage and Destiny

by M. Eugene Osterhaven

THE QUESTION to which attention will be directed ı this paper is why, in view of the character of ıeir heritage, the Reformed Churches of the Dutch radition are not making a more significant impact ı their American environment. The subject of ıe environment in which we find ourselves has een discussed before in these pages, and I have no uarrel but only agreement with what has been aid. I desire only to continue that discussion beause of its importance.

A stimulus to my interest in this question was recent conference held at Calvin College on the ıeme "Calvinism: Status and Prospects." Sponored by the Calvinistic Action Committee and nderwritten by the Calvin Foundation, the conerence, limited to little more than a score of articipants, provided intellectual stimulation and ood fellowship.

THAT WE who by God's providence are in the Reformed ecclesiastical tradition have a heritage f no mean import need not be argued in this ournal. Humbly, I trust, and sincerely, I am sure, re thank Him who has entered into covenant with His people for having placed us in the Church of Jesus Christ which has been Reformed according o His Word. Familiarity often breeds contempt, nd proximity to our heritage can make us immune o appreciation of it. Remembrance, however, of ur having been *Reformed* in the doctrines of the Christian faith, so that the gospel is seen in its ıeavenly beauty; of our having been *Reformed* ı the government of the Church, so that the rule f Pope and Bishop has been supplanted by a demoratic policy agreeable to the Word of God and he inspiration for far-reaching civil reform; of our having been *Reformed* in worship, so that altar and priest have given way to the prophetic ministry of the Word; in fine, remembrance that we have been *Reformed* according to God's Word in a comprehensive sense, so that all of life is lived as under His judgment and grace — I say, remembrance of *that heritage* can be an overwhelming consideration. Indeed, we have a rich legacy which comes to us from our parents and more remote forebears, yes, but ultimately from God.

Nor is ours a tradition which stems from the Reformation of the sixteenth century without the blessing of later periodic religious revival. For during the last century, in the distant land in whose soil many of us have had deep roots, God caused a freshening movement of the Spirit which brought flesh and life to dry bones and which continues with us yet.

Again, ours is a heritage inclusive of the blessings and favors shared by Americans. The opportunities and privileges of living in this still new land with its fabulous resources, expanding economy and religiously propitious atmosphere have been bestowed upon us. Of all persons we could most properly erect an Ebenezer-stone and lift our voices in a psalm of thanksgiving to God.

BLESSINGS mean responsibility, and responsibility must be discharged if we are not to be disobedient. To whom much has been committed, from him shall much be required. Gifts and privilege are never for our own exclusive use, but are to be used in the service of our fellowmen. The Bible makes that clear. The blessings which we have received from God, therefore, should cause us, American Calvinist Christians, to be among

Heritage and Destiny — Continued

the most aggressive, *not* merely in ministering to ourselves, our institutions and our children, but in ministering to the lost world all about us. As the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, so we, His disciples, should live to minister and to give our lives in His service.

To return to the question, in consideration of our heritage and of our consequent obligation, are we as Reformed Churches making a significant impact on the environment in which God has placed us? The very raising of the question is disconcerting. It has been shown, for example, that in one of our ecclesiastical Zions, the city of Grand Rapids, where thirty-six percent of the people are members of the Reformed Churches and other thousands out of the total population of 180,000 belong to other orthodox Christian churches, we have not done so well. In a study of (1) Negro-white relationships, (2) working women and mothers, and (3) divorce, Grand Rapids compares unfavorably with the country at large (Donald H. Bouma, *The Calvin Forum,* October, 1955). Such statistics give some of our talk about our comprehensive life and world view and our application of doctrine to life a hollow ring.

A great conundrum to me, however, is our slow growth. Whereas we who have the best should be busily engaged in giving it to others, our tendency seems to be to keep it for ourselves. However, the truth spoken by our Lord when He said that whosoever seeks to save his life (keep it for himself) will lose it, may be in evidence here. In the Reformed Church in America, for instance, one of our regional synods not only failed to evangelize, but in 41 years, from 1900 to 1941, had a net loss of 34 churches. Denominationally, between 1915 and 1935, we grew only from 718 to 726 congregations. Lately we have done better — the number of churches is now 825 — but our increase is still slow in view of the increase in population and opportunities for church extension.

The Christian Reformed Church has not done better evangelistically. Its growth in recent years has been rapid, but the growth has come largely by immigration and from within.

That which makes all this doubly disturbing is the rate of growth of other conservative, confessional bodies in our country. *Time* magazine featured the Southern Baptists within the past year and, along with the rest of the impressive story, related that the net worth of Southern Baptist physical properties has been *quadrupled* since 1945. The Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, added 1,000 new congregations in the past decade and plans to add 1,350 during the next. Another interesting feature of that Church's program is its forthcoming $25,000,000 building program at Valparaiso University. In expansion, however, the Southern Baptists and Missouri Synod Lutherans run a poor second to a number of Pentecostal bodies, some of the denominations of which are now larger than the combined Reformed-Christian Reformed Churches and are growing rapidly. The Church of the Nazarene, not one of the larger Pentecostal bodies, at its recent General Assembly meeting disclosed the addition of 37,000 communicants during the past quadrennium, making a total of 280,000 members; its Sunday School enrollment gained 21 per cent, to 605,000. Its $10,000,000 mission goal was exceeded by a half a million dollars. Most interestingly, for our purpose, its objectives for 1960 are 1,000 new churches, 150,000 new members on confession of faith, a Sunday School enrollment of 1,000,000 and $14,000,000 for missions and evangelism.

I AM QUITE AWARE of the fact that the recitation of such facts and figures can be a futile exercise, especially when they are countered with the defensive rejoinder that our interest is in quality and not in a large quantity of members. These facts and figures speak significantly, however, and cannot be evaded. In my own fellowship I have heard reference made to Gideon's band as a reminder of God's ability to do great things with small numbers. That impressed me once, until I recalled that if our smallness is due to our lack of evangelistic zeal and our unwillingness to witness, God might *not* use but use other, obedient, groups instead. As one whose roots are deep in the Reformed tradition it is hard for me to believe that God might, to large measure, by-pass my own communion in His great program of the evangelization of the nations. Yet that that is a distinct possibility I dare no longer deny. I am well aware of the fact that we shall probably always have some churches in, let us say, Iowa and Michigan, and that there may well always be a Reformed and a Christian Reformed Church. But a dogged determination to hold on, or merely to advance in the manner in which we have been edging forward in our more than three hundred years of history in this country, *is not making a significant impact on American culture, nor is it discharging our evangelistic obligation.* We who claim to have the best should do the most, not only for ourselves but in presenting Christ to others. The sober fact is that our Lord has been using other groups in a larger way than He has been using us in the evangelization of America, while we, sitting contentedly in our little covenant communities, have been unaware of it. Living in a small area of the country where we have a relatively large num-

f congregations of the Reformed persuasion with ur institutions in our midst, it is possible for us o become so provincial that we come unconsciously o assume that the American Christian world, at east the "true" American Christian world, revolves bout us! Ignorance may be bliss, but it is also langerous when God informs us that, if we do not reach the gospel "to all nations and to all persons romiscuously and without distinction" (Canons f Dort, II/V), our brother's blood will be required t our hand. As evangelical Christians we believe hat multitudes are perishing, but we do not seem o believe, or perhaps care, that a reason for it is ur almost exclusive preoccupation with *our*selves, *ur* congregation, and *our* covenant children. Our eritage is precious, but it is no more of a guarantee or the future than was Israel's in the time of Jere- niah. Israel's futile and pathetic lament, "The emple, the temple, the temple of God are these," tands as a reminder to God's people that a blessed ast is never a substitute for present faithfulness, nd that a mere grasping after one's inherited insti- utions may be an evidence of fear and of an in- bility to measure up to the challenge of the present.

WHAT THEN ought we to do? If the foregoing discussion has merit it is patent that we ought to be doing something. In the following suggestions there is also an attempt to answer the question with which this discussion began.

First, it is necessary that we divest ourselves of our Dutch clannishness. We shall never become truly American Churches able significantly to in- fluence the American environment in which God has placed us until we lose our Dutch self-con- sciousness. Perhaps this is asking too much, for we cannot cut ourselves off from what we have so recently been, or are! With my own roots in Vriesland and Grand Rapids and my residence now in Holland — all within a radius of about fifteen miles! — this presents a personal problem to me. I am confident, however, that our identification with our Dutch background is a greater handicap to our effectively reaching out than we are aware. There are, for example, Reformed congregations which have never heard a sermon in the Holland language which are identified, not without reason, by people living next door as "Dutch" churches. We even have conscientious folk fearing that, if a majority within a consistory or a congregation were not Dutch, the church might lose its orthodoxy. Although there are exceptions which but prove the rule, for purity of faith, or rather, fellowship with us, Dutch blood or a good Dutch name is eminently useful.

In the preceding sentence the change to "fellow- ship" was made because therein lies the problem. Often it is not so much a matter of faith as it is our Dutch clannishness which keeps us as we are, relatively isolated on this large continent, far re- moved from Dutch shores. There was a certain clannishness in the old Dutch of New York and New Jersey and there has been such among the Reformed people who settled in the Midwest. Under- standably, the pioneers of Dutch Calvinism in the Midwest wanted to retain the cultural and religious heritage achieved at such great cost. Many of them adopted, therefore, as it has been properly called, a kind of "deliberate ecclesiastical and cultural isolationism." Much of that spirit remains with us yet.

A professional man of another background moved into one of our small mid-western cities largely dominated by Reformed and Christian Reformed churches, and visited a number of them only to find himself a stranger who was not taken in. As a result he finally became attached to a church of another fellowship in a neighboring community. One day he told me the whole story. The incident is not an isolated one. Prospective members have been made to feel that since they do not have *"neer- landsch bloed"* flowing in their veins, *"van vreemde smetten vrij,"* they will be looked upon as second- class citizens in our ecclesiastical fellowship. This is not true of some of our newer congregations, but it has been all too true of those where there has been a desire to retain the Dutch character of our churches. To which we add that persons of that old mold should not have left the Netherlands in the first place!

SECONDLY, the condition described above is good soil for the growth of a noxious plant called provincialism, the ecclesiastical eradication of which is necessary. I use the adjective "ecclesiastical" because many of our people have already personally divested themselves of this weakness through their social contacts and interests. And that is why some of them feel a bit ashamed of the old church in which they were nurtured, and so easily leave our congregations to take membership elsewhere when their academic training has been completed and they are ready to launch their business or pro- fessional career. There is something wholesome and refreshing about an atmosphere of cosmo- politanism, the atmosphere proper for the Holy *Catholic* Church, and something shriveling about the atmosphere of provincialism. In too many of our circles there is a feeling of being ill at ease when the cultured stranger is in our midst and de- sires conversation with us. In too many of our ecclesiastical assemblies, I believe, judgments con- cerning our associations with other Christians have been made, at least in part, on the basis of socio- logical considerations. We have feared, or re-

sented, meeting other folks and discussing our problems with them. Too many of our ministers have not read anything new worth speaking about since they received their seminary diploma nor have their vacations offered them anything more broadening than visits home with the parents and parents-in-law and a week at a cottage. What they most needed was a summer course at some place of learning, two weeks at an Institute of Theology, or travel. But their weary spirits did not perceive it, their pocketbooks would not allow it, and their shrunken minds could not believe it. Time and the pressing routine of labor does not ameliorate that condition but aggravates it. The circle of one's interest increasingly becomes smaller and the capacity for wide appreciation becomes less and less.

In an address delivered before the General Synod of the Reformed Church at a crisis in its history a few years ago, the speaker, who had been given the subject for his address, stated that "the Reformed Church has lived in a snail's shell for too long, and it is not a healthy habitation." Many other uncomplimentary judgments were spoken, but Synod, visibly moved, took them to heart and ordered the address printed. (Howard G. Hageman, "Becoming What We Are," *The Church Herald,* Sept. 29, 1950). A colleague in our sister denomination had something similar in mind for his own Church when he exhorted it to join with other Christians, *ipsis verbis,* "as we emerge from our cocoon" (John H. Kromminga, "Our Dilemma in Communication," *The Reformed Journal,* Oct. 1955). But of all that might be said to combat the provincialism in our combined midst, it would be difficult to imagine anything more effective than an essay entitled *Of Writing Many Books,* which it would be well for those of us who think that we have the Calvinistic world by the tail to read once, *and again* (*The Reformed Journal,* Jan., 1955).

THIRDLY, a further requirement, if we are to benefit our environment with the Reformed character of our heritage, is that we retain that character. Its loss would give us no justification for continuing our existence as *Reformed* churches. In the address by Hageman referred to there are pointed remarks on this issue. Inasmuch as General Synod received the address with enthusiasm I shall quote from it rather than express the matter in my own language. Asking why we feel there should still be a Reformed Church in America, he continues: "What contribution have we to make to the religious life of this nation that is not already being made? What have we to say to this people that is not already being said? What distinctive message we have to proclaim to this day and generation th has not already been sounded? . . . Out of c confessions there emerges a very definite and p ticular kind of church life which by and large have lost. We show that we have lost it by the w in which we desperately grope for something put in its place. In some places we have congreg tions which are held together by the magne power of one personality. In other instances try to achieve some solidarity by appealing to national tradition. In still other instances we t to maintain ourselves by the simple fact that happen to be in a particular community and lit ally try to build our church life upon the found tion of geographical convenience.

"But you cannot build a church upon any these foundations, and we have paid a terrible pr for trying it. The magnetic personality dies a his successor may be a dull clod; national strai die or rather are lost in the molding process th goes on in American life, as they should be. T day's community very often becomes tomorrow slum. I know of no sadder experience than to ta a tour of some of our large Eastern cities with history book to learn that on this corner once sto the First Reformed Church where Dr. Blank min tered to a large and prosperous congregation; this square once stood the Second Reformed Chur surrounded by the palatial homes of an excelle residential community; in the middle of this blo stood the Third Reformed Church which had great ministry among the Dutch people in the ar And today they are all gone! Other churches ha not moved out. They face changed situations; th minister in a very different way to a very differe community from former days. But they are s there, and more often than not you will find th those churches which have held their ground wh we have retreated are precisely those churches wh are held together by a distinctive pattern of chur life and loyalty."

What more need be said? The lesson from h tory is there for all to read.

A FOURTH necessity is that we understand m clearly the mission of the Church. We are preach the gospel, to teach all men, all nations, a we are the body of Christ only as we fulfill that fu tion. Hendrick Kraemer has shown the close lationship of the Church to its mission, that th are as twins born at Pentecost, that the Apost were first of all missionaries, and that faith cann exist without witnessing. The Church, as he sho is not just a worshiping community but is the bo of Christ witnessing to the world. A. A. van Rule emphasis is as sharp. Mission, witnessing to Chri

of the very essence of the Church, he holds. It is ot proper to speak of the Church's mission as a unction of the Church, but rather the Church is function of the mission of God. These two schol-rs, with others, have, with this and other Biblical mphases, helped in the renewal of the Nether-nds Reformed Church and given it a new sense its mission in the world.

And they are right. God saves us that we may erve. As the Father sent the Son into the world, o the Son now sends us — to witness. But others n our circle of thought and work have written on his so I shall not labor the point beyond mention-ng one further detail. There is a section in Lesslie Newbigin's book, *The Household of God,* which ame as a revelation to me when I first read it. t is a discussion of the Holy Spirit and our election n Christ. The argument is that if one, Hindu-like, onceives of election abstractly, he runs into such nanswerable questions as why God chose one and ot the other, answers known to God alone. "But," e says, "if we cannot know for what *reason* one as chosen, we can most certainly know for what *urpose* he was chosen: he was chosen in order o be a fruit-bearing branch of the one true vine John 15:16), a witness through whom others night be saved. He is chosen in order that through him God's saving purpose may reach to others, nd they too may be reconciled to God in and hrough His reconciled and reconciling people. And while the ultimate mystery of election remains, one an see that the principle of election is the only principle congruous with the nature of God's re-demptive purpose.

"And we can also see that wherever the mission-ary character of the doctrine of election is forgotten; wherever it is forgotten that we are chosen in order to be sent; wherever the minds of believers are concerned more to probe backwards from their election into the reasons for it in the secret counsel of God than to press forward from their election to the purpose of it, which is that they should be Christ's ambassadors and witnesses to the ends of the earth; wherever men think that the purpose of election is their own salvation rather than the salvation of the world; then God's people have be-trayed their trust" (p. 111).

Too long some of us have interpreted election in egocentric terms and have failed to do justice to the New Testament doctrine. With a clearer under-standing of our mission in the world as chosen in Christ we may make our impact on our environ-ment greater.

FIFTHLY, it is also necessary that we feel a burden for the lost world about us. It is possible for us, blessed as we have been, to be deeply stirred by gratitude for our salvation, and to stop there. We should feel equally, if not more stirred when we look from ourselves to the evidences of spiritual death in others. But our hearts are hardened; we have not been made sensitive to the needs of our Christ-less fellows. We may feel slightly moti-vated to do something to reach them now and then; we make some small efforts. But it is more proba-ble that most of us rationalize that they have had their chance and were rejected. Then, using the doc-trines of election and reprobation as an escape from an unpleasant burden, we seek to dismiss considera-tions of responsibility and go back to hold the hands of the saints and convince ourselves that we are doing our Lord's will. Or, we may reason that other, "more evangelistically minded groups" will reach those people, while we concentrate on other matters, ourselves. Is it any wonder that God is blessing such "evangelistically minded groups" and that they are on the move — the Nazarenes with their 280,000 members expecting 150,000 conver-sions within the next four years! — while we keep treading water in our impact on others? Perhaps we can learn something from our Fundamentalist brethren who speak so frequently about their bur-den for the lost.

SIXTHLY, I close with mention of our most funda-mental need, prayer and the Holy Spirit. But may there not yet be added blessings from God? None of us prays as he ought and none of us is a Spirit-filled person. If, somehow, with all the admirable qualities that have been given us in our heritage, we could have the holy fire that has illumined and energized some who, as they put it, claim the promises of the Lord, there might be blessings in the years before us that we dare not now imagine.

O holy and ever-blessed Spirit, who didst overshadow the holy Virgin-mother of our Lord, and causedst her to conceive by a miraculous and mysterious manner, be pleased to overshadow my soul, and en-lighten my spirit, that I may conceive the holy Jesus in my heart, and may bear Him in my mind, and may grow up to the ful-ness of the stature of Christ, to be a perfect man in Christ Jesus. Amen.

—from *Holy Living,* by Jeremy Taylor, 1613-1667

Pages From the Past

For the Centennial Year — a collection of contemporary accounts and documents which reflect something of the origins a the developing life of the Christian Reformed Church. Selected and edited by Dr. George Stob

Critics of the Union With the Reformed Protestant Dutch Churc

The union of the Dutch immigrant church of Western Michigan, organized in 1848 into Classis Holland, with the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, was consummated in June 1850 by the favorable action of the General Synod of the latter church. The union was "a source of joy and gratitude" to Classis Holland, which resolved "to cherish the same cordially and tenderly." The General Synod of the older church body was also happy with these new accessions, and expressed the hope that "the union they have formed with us will be of lasting mutual benefit."

The union was not gratifying to all of the immigrants, however. Some were greatly displeased, were persistently critical of the church body they had joined, and fostered in the Western Michigan settlement a spirit which led to a Secession from the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church in 1857.

One of the complaints was that the union was a hasty and ill-considered action, and that it was concluded by leaders who did not consult the people in the congregation. This criticism is reflected in an account by one of the early settlers, a certain Mr. A. Peyster, who some years later wrote:

In a meeting of ministers and some Consistory members, numbering about twenty persons, the transfer to the Reformed Church took place, without any knowledge on the part of the members. After it had happened and became publicly known, the members of Zeeland said to me: "We have been sold, without our knowing it." The ministers tried to set us at rest, and people believed them. There was, after all, respect and esteem for them. But the ministers had acted arbitrarily, and decidedly not in the ecclesiastical way, because the congregations were not called together, and they were not asked if they wanted this. For that reason some of the elders, who were in the movement at that time, later withdrew from it.

In the years '51 and '52, two ministers went to the East. An aged, pious elder went along, in order to see and hear how it was over there. This old man, however, could not understand any English. At the Fall meeting of the Classis, to which I was also delegated, I heard him give a beautiful account, namely: "We might well be content and happy, because they were all pious men who loved Brakel and Smytegeld [early Dutch experientialist writers, who were greatly loved by the Seceders of the Netherlands —Ed.]. I was blind then, and as a result of that became more blind." (From *De Wachter,* Oct. 10, 1888, quoted by G. K. Hemkes, *Het Rechtsbestaan der Hollandsche Christeli Gereformeerde Kerk,* pp. 49, 50).

Another account of the dissatisfaction within the We ern Michigan colony, and a statement of some of the r sons for it, was given by another early settler, Mr. T. berg, in reminiscences written by him in 1883.

In his narrative, Mr. Ulberg notes that he and his fa ily arrived, after a good deal of difficulty and hards enroute, at the home of friends in Drenthe, Michigan. their first arrival, Mr. Ulberg relates:

They set food before us, but I couldn't eat. could only drink. And there I wept for the fi time in the colony, because people were then alrea in conflict on a certain matter with reference the church. Rev. Ypma was to preach there on ternate Sundays, and people did not understa each other. I couldn't bear the arguing a thought: have we just arrived and are we alrea at odds with each other. What is to become of th

Mr. Ulberg settled ultimately in Vriesland, Michig Of his later experiences he reported:

In 1849 the ministers Ypma, Van Raalte, a Wyckoff came to us. We were very happy, a with Rev. Wyckoff, since we knew the revere gentleman as a result of daily association with h in Albany. At that time Rev. Wyckoff put question "if the people did not want to unite w the Dutch Reformed Church?"

There was no answer to that question.

"Our Church offers advantages," he said.

"You are yet in your infancy, but if you come mature years and you do not then find it congen with us, then you can offer us the hand of broth hood and be by yourselves. You also have need an itinerant preacher. You can call one out of H land, or elsewhere, and our Board will give $2 for that purpose, and if the congregations can a do something for this cause, it ought to go easil

I am now the only living person of the four whom this proposal was first made. Two wee later the Classis gathered. At that time Van Raa showed himself to be a man. There were elders a others who were very much taken in by the p posal of Rev. Wyckoff. They said: "We must do and it is not necessary to ask the congregatio about it." Dr. Van Raalte said: "Brothers, that

not right, I warn you. If, afterwards, it proves to be wrong, then we will get the blame. Let us set this matter before the congregations, and if it should turn out to be a mistake, then the blame will rest also upon the congregations."

In 1851 already there was disquiet with reference to the union. We met in a log school-house in Vriesland. I had come from the East, and people asked me, since I had been in Albany for nine months, what I knew about it.

"What I know about it," I said, "I can tell."

1. "I have never heard any preaching over the Catechism there, also not in the church of Rev. Wyckoff.

2. "They don't observe any religious holidays there. When I was in Albany I asked my boss once: 'How is it, boss, that there is no Catechism preaching here?' 'That I don't know. Do they preach out of the Catechism in Holland?'

"'Yes.'

3. "Further, I have never been present at a baptism in the congregational meeting. That happened in the Consistory room, and for the rich, at their homes. I once joined in the Lord's Supper, and at that time the blacks were completely separated. I asked later, 'Why should that be done, boss, that the blacks sit altogether apart and don't join in the Lord's Supper?'

"'Well, if your wife should die and you were to marry another, would you then want a black one?'

"'No, not exactly. But this is quite another matter. If at last all the peoples of the earth appear before the judgment seat of Christ, won't all differences then be absent? With God there is no respect of persons. May we make such distinctions in religious matters?'

"The boss didn't answer." (From *Jaarboekje,* Christian Reformed Church, 1883, pp. 71, 75-77).

The severest and most persistent critic of the Union, however, was Mr. Gijsbert Haan. Mr. Haan was discerning, articulate, of strong spirit, and self-assured. He not only contributed to the spread of a considerable measure of discontent with the union throughout the colony; in the Classical assemblies he played the part of the "leader of the opposition," and in his own congregation at Grand Rapids he precipitated a crisis which resulted in the first movement toward Secession. Gijsbert Haan may well be considered the moving spirit of the Secession of 1857, and the father of the Christian Reformed Church.

Gijsbert Haan "arrived in Michigan soon after the visit of Wyckoff, and after a residence of two years in New York and New Jersey." The late Professor D. H. Kromminga observed that he was a follower of Van Velzen in the Netherlands. "Van Velzen and his group were concerned about the preservation of the Reformed character of the Church more than about fellowship with kindred minds outside the organization. They had over against them the group of Brummelkamp, which was fellowshipping with the leaders of the Reformed persuasion in the State Church and which for some time had shown a readiness to give to those leaders a decisive share in the control over the theological training of ministers also for the Church of the Seceders. Van Raalte plainly represented the inclusive tendency among the seceders in this country, and now Haan came to represent here the strictly ecclesiastical tendency among them." (D. H. Kromminga, *The Christian Reformed Tradition,* p. 108).

In 1871 Gijsbert Haan published a brochure entitled: *Stem Eens Belasterden* (*The Voice of One Maligned*), in defense of charges registered against him in a publication by two Dutch Reformed ministers, B. De Bey and Z. Zwemer, entitled: *Stemmen uit de Hollandsch Gereformeerde Kerk* (*Voices from the Dutch Reformed Church*). The "Stem" is Gijsbert Haan's *Apologia Pro Vita Sua,* and is significant for its extensive accounts of the thinking and experience that led him to play the leading role in the Secession of 1857. I hope in this and in a succeeding issue of the *Journal* to give in translation such large excerpts from Haan's writing as to constitute an almost complete reproduction of it.

After giving the reasons for his writing, and an account of his emigration to America, Haan notes that he first settled in the East of America, and had opportunity closely to observe the Dutch Reformed Church. He found that church exemplary in her helpfulness toward the Holland immigrants, but less than exemplary in her doctrine, discipline, and ecclesiastical practice. The narrative of Haan continues:

If these people were helpful and therefore to be commended in things relating to the natural life, in ecclesiastical matters there was much that deserved disapproval, to my way of thinking, namely, a collection of about 800 hymns, through which the Psalms were displaced; a Choir, which hindered the congregation in lifting their hearts in song to the Lord, in order to praise Him with Psalms; no Catechism preaching; no Catechism other than the Sunday School, where Bible History was taught, indeed, but no fundamental doctrines were considered, which is the reason why many of the rising generation do not know what is really the doctrine of their church, and therefore feel quite as much at home with other denominations.

This may appear to be desirable for all of those who inclined toward the exercise of brotherhood (*welke zoo tot verbroedering overhellen*), but for those who want to hold fast to the doctrine, discipline, and practice of the Reformed Church, it is deplorable. Or is it not to be deplored that people are so ignorant in matters of Religion that the Professors at New Brunswick [the training school for ministers of the Dutch Reformed Church —Ed.] declare — as was told to me by one of the Holland ministers, who also had a son at the Academy — that the Holland students are already instructed in theology before they come here, which cannot be said of Americans, and this was to be attributed to nothing other than the instruction given in matters of doctrine in the Catechism class.

I also found very often that ignorance of doctrine was very great: for when once I was visiting an elder and our conversation led to the Sovereignty of God in the election of some while others were passed by, the elder cried out: "I can't believe that, oh no! God is so good! God is so good!" etc. And was this surprising if one takes into consideration that afterwards a minister from the East was delegated by the Synod to visit the churches in the West (it

was Dr. Gerritson, a man who had grown old in the service), also came to Grand Rapids, and was asked by Rev. Klyn to preach on the doctrine of predestination, because it was so often said about the Dutch Reformed Church that they didn't teach it, to which he (Dr. Gerritson) replied: "I am willing to try, but I must confess that I have never preached about it." These are now the fruits of that deplorable exercise of brotherhood (*betreurenswaardige verbroedering*); it must carry the fundamental doctrines away in her progress or it cannot be achieved. . . .

In New York I also became acquainted with the fact that a large part of the ministers and members of the Dutch Reformed Church belonged to the abominable orders of secret societies, and were not ashamed of it, oh no, they made open profession of it. . . .

After I had spent some time in New York, I moved from there to New Jersey and settled not far from Paterson, and lived there in the same house with an elder of the Dutch Reformed Church. Because this man spoke fairly good Holland, and liked to converse, we were often in conversation with each other, and among other things he told me that he had nine children, but not one of them had received the covenant seal of Holy Baptism. Upon my question: "But Van Es, is that right?" I got for answer: "Oh, yes, I would rather let them grow up, and then they can choose for themselves which denomination they want to join." To my next question, whether the matter as to where they were church members was of such little importance, the answer was: "Most assuredly! We differ only in name or title from the Baptists, Methodists, and other denominations; there is no difference in doctrine." There, too, I saw how far this exercise of brotherhood extended. Minister and elder could attend church and go to the Lord's Supper with Methodists, and thus give expression to their union with those who deny and reject all the fundamental doctrines of the Reformed Church, so that I found it no better there than in New York.

About that time I met and spoke with Rev. Eltinge. Our conversation was rather lengthy, (he was the man of whom the former editor of *De Hope* spoke with so much praise). [*De Hope*, church paper published by the Dutch Reformed Church in the Holland language —Ed.] Of that long conversation I will not say much, but only this: if people could speak with praise about Dr. Eltinge, they could with the same right do that with reference to Arminius. He did not remain a stranger to me in his preaching either, being able to very nearly repeat Comrie [defender of the orthodox of Dort, in 18th century Holland —Ed.] on I Peter 2:4, while at another time he didn't hesitate to ridicule piou exercises, saying: these are what we call fa natics. . . .

After I had spent some time in New York, it wa the Lord's leading that I should depart and sett in Troy, near Albany. Since these places were no far distant from each other, and in the last-name there were more Hollanders residing, I spent a goo deal of time there, and learned to know Dr. Wycko and Rev. Bellingen. The last named was an excep tionally godly man, and genuinely orthodox; h belonged to the Seceders [who separated from th Dutch Reformed Church in 1822 —Ed.]. An neither may it be denied that Dr. Wyckoff was a exceptionally likeable person, with many prais worthy qualities, ready to be helpful to all peopl but most of all the Holland people. . . . Howeve even though he possessed many good qualities an occupied a large place in the Dutch Reforme Church, he was less qualified to be pastor an teacher in the Reformed Church, for which a fe evidences will be proof enough.

A lady at Albany related that she belonged to th Presbyterian Church, but because they taught the that God had from eternity chosen some to salv tion and passed others by, and that we could d nothing towards our salvation but must recei everything by grace, for which reason she had r signed and joined with Dr. Wyckoff, because he d not teach that. Further: at a certain time a mi ister came to this place from the Netherlands; was someone who because of his offensive behavi had been deposed in the so-called Hervormde Ke [the State-Church of the Netherlands —Ed.]. Th man, who of course also wanted a position or mea of living, sought to settle there and preached for t Hollanders, just as he was, that is, altogether li eral. After the people had heard him once a again, they left him because of his lack of orth doxy. The man now betook himself to the abov named Dr. with the request that he examine h sermon, and he willingly took this upon himse and answered that he didn't find anything whi could merit his disapproval, adding: "I don't kno what those people want."

One day when I visited Dr. Wyckoff, almost t first thing that I heard was: "Haan! I have be appointed by the Synod to go to the West, to vi the Holland people, with request they join with u and this they must do, because they are poor, a then we can help them along, and if it doesn't su them after awhile, when they have grown, then th can separate from us again." Thereupon I answer only: "Domine!" He said then: "I do it in ord to help them, and they must do it." Upon my r mark that they then must not unite with t Church, and when this had taken place that th might not secede from the Church, he continue

'Yes, Yes! I do it in order to help them, and they nust do it." . . . .

As I related above, Dr. Wyckoff was appointed by Synod and had left for the West, and having returned after awhile, he made his report to the Synod and had it published for distribution, of which I also have received a copy. This report was in essence as follows: That he had found there a people exceptionally pious, a people almost like the first Christians, a people who would not partake of any meal, no matter how simple, without prayer, and would not rise from the table without the singing of Psalms and the giving of thanks; a wonderful people in America; but when this people had been asked to come together and proposals were made for union with the Dutch Reformed Church, there was much opposition among this people. They indicated that they had too much experience with a church-organization in the Netherlands, than that they should suddenly unite with a denomination with which they were altogether unacquainted. And no matter what Dr. Wyckoff and the other ministers were able to say, they continued to refuse, until finally it was proposed by Dr. Wyckoff that they should unite under these conditions: "*Should it afterwards appear that the Dutch Reformed Church, in doctrine and government, was not as had been decided at the Synod of Dort, the people could then bid her a fraternal farewell, and conduct themselves as they might judge best.*" The reader will please keep this in mind from now on, that the union with the Dutch Reformed Church was conditional. From this time ministers were paid out of the Missions Budget and enjoyed still other benefits from the Dutch Reformed Church.

Haan's report and representation is not characterized by the most scrupulous kind of exactness. See Wyckoff's mandate and report in *The Reformed Journal*, Sept. 1956, pp. 13-16.

After these events it pleased the Lord so to direct matters that I had to leave the East and I undertook to journey West in order to settle there. Having arrived there, I found it quite different than I had anticipated; for after Dr. Wyckoff had departed, unfavorable reports had been spread among the people concerning the Dutch Reformed Church, by those who had come out of the East, so that I found many people alarmed and disturbed about their ecclesiastical affiliation. "Rev. Van Raalte has sold us out!" some of them cried, and others employed still stronger expressions. I, too, wherever I came, was plied with questions concerning the Church in America, and I have given truthful report to ministers and people about how I had found it, making the judgment that according to my insight it was careless for them to have gone over to the step of union.

This and other things caused the people to become more and more uneasy and dissatisfied. Added to this was the fact that some of the ministers permitted themselves to be led along by those things that were very much in conflict with their ministry, and gave occasion that they were sometimes slandered. In the preaching, too, they began to allow expressions in conflict with the doctrine of the Reformed Church, and at times they began to irritate and vex the people, as was the case at Vriesland [where Haan had settled —Ed.]

The religious holidays were not observed there, even though the people desired it, neither was the passion material dealt with, until it had been urgently requested, and then the minister did nothing else for a quarter of a year than to preach passion sermons. The people, knowing what the reason was for this, were embittered; and this behavior, together with the remarks that people had to make about the preaching, didn't improve the situation in the congregation of Vriesland.

At this point Haan relates his charge that Rev. Ypma, who had purchased land for Haan, had taken advantage of Haan to the extent of $70 and 40 acres of land. Haan took up the matter with Rev. Ypma, and later with the consistory, but, as he reported, without result.

Haan continues:

I continued to attend the preaching, though there was much that could be said about it, until the departure from the true doctrine was so palpable that I could no longer listen to it, and decided to read a good sermon along with my family on Sundays, rather than vex myself any longer with the preaching; and though it was contrary to my intention, my home was now full on Sunday with those who had an aversion to the discourses that were delivered in the church building. The result of all this was that a meeting was called in order to inquire into the cause of the estrangement, at which meeting Rev. Vander Meulen served as President and Rev. Van Raalte as Secretary, along with the elders of Vriesland and Zeeland. They began to talk about the land dispute, but since I soon observed that Rev. Ypma was not the only guilty one, I said: "Brothers, in order to obviate serious difficulties, I think it is better to drop the land question, and let it up to the conscience of the person who is guilty in the matter."

Since this proposal found favor with the gathering, it was decided to deal with the other objections, and the matter of preaching was on the table. Having been asked by the President to give my story, I related how Rev. Ypma had dealt with the words of John 3:14, Luke 20:34, and others. After this the President asked Rev. Ypma if this, which Haan had related, was really true? to which neither a Yes or No was heard. The only thing he (Ypma) answered was that there were people who had

Pages from the Past — Continued

been edified by his preaching. But when the Consistory and members of the congregation confirmed what I had related, the President said: "Rev. Ypma, you are in duty bound to make confession of guilt before this gathering and before the brothers, because of your improper discourses." The Secretary added to it: "If you can't confess guilt on this score, then I don't know any more!" But everything was fruitless, since he continued to refuse. I spoke, saying: "Brothers, don't make the pressure too strong, because a forced confession doesn't serve us; when Rev. Ypma really senses his guilt, it will be heard from the pulpit." Thereupon there was an endeavor to heal the breach as far as possible, Rev. Ypma was expected to refrain from proclaiming the Word of God in such a fashion, and we were join in worship with the congregation again, an as much as possible, forgive one another.

This carries Gijsbert Haan's narrative of his expe ences in the Dutch Reformed Church from the time his arrival in America and his eventual settlement Vriesland, Michigan, to the time of his departure fr Vriesland for residence in Grand Rapids, Michigan. Af having lived in Vriesland for a year and a half, Ha moved to Grand Rapids. There, as a member and el in the Grand Rapids church, and as a delegate to Clas Holland, he was outspoken in his criticism of the Du Reformed Church, the center of several disputes in Co sistory and Classis, and led a movement of dissent th resulted in schism within the Grand Rapids church, a ultimately a secession of several churches, including th of Grand Rapids, from Classis Holland.

In the next issue of the *Journal* we will continue t narrative of Gijsbert Haan from the time of his remo from Vriesland to Grand Rapids, Michigan, and to t time of the beginnings of the Secession.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE NUN'S STORY. *By Kathryn Hulme.* 339 pp. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1956. $4.00.

Reviewed by Arthur Otten, Instructor in French, Calvin College.

It is not at all surprising that Kathryn Hulme's latest book ranks high on current best seller lists. *The Nun's Story* has many of the qualities of a successful and even of a good book, and it participates in the respectability once again enjoyed by the portrayal of religious experience. It is a fictionalized account of the life of Sister Luke, a Belgian girl who after seventeen years as a nun in a prominent nursing order returns to the world she had earlier renounced, though she remains in the Catholic church.

The Nun's Story has a wide appeal and can be read for a variety of reasons. For the curious it supplies an intimate account of convent life, dealing not only with religious practice and the difficulty of observing the Holy Rule, but also with such matters as the shorn hair of the nuns and the repression of the passions. Those who like adventure will enjoy the accounts of life among the blacks of the Belgian Congo and of the hiding of Allied aviators in the convent in Belgium during World War II. For those who share the current adulation of the medical profession there are gripping scenes in laboratory and operating room, including the inevitably successful surgery performed by Sister Luke during the inevitable absence of the famous resident surgeon.

All of these, however, miss what should and can be the real significance of the book: the attempt to portray the development of a soul in its search for perfection. Gabrielle van der Mal was already embarked on the Christian journey when she chose the religious life and the name of Sister Luke. The years of her novitiate and of her service as nursing nun were marked by intense struggle to negate the self, to conform to the "life against nature" demanded by the Holy Rule, and to learn true and genuine humility and obedience. Her struggle is the theme that pervades the entire book. It culminates in her final decision to ask release from her vows.

Those who will seek proof in this work for the naive claim that the life of monastery or convent is untenable will be disappointed. The basic question of the book is not one of illustrating how "you cannot flee the world by secluding yourself within the walls of a monastery for you will take the world right along with you, inside your heart." The question is rather whether or not the religious life happened to be the right life for one particular person, Gabrielle van der Mal. Her return to the world may have marked her failure as a nun, but more important it was for her a step ahead on the road to perfection.

SECOND THOUGHTS ON THE DEAD S Scrolls. *By F. F. Bruce.* 144 Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdm Publishing Co., 1956. $2.50.

Reviewed by Millar Burrows, Cha man of Department of Near East Languages and Literatures, Gradu School, Yale University.

Books about the Dead Sea Scr have been coming out rapidly t year. Some of them are very go others not so good. Among the be ones I would rate this brief, sim work of Professor Bruce. If it can be called especially profound or or nal, it is at least clear, readable, com tent, balanced, and reliable.

In his preface the author, who Professor of Biblical History and L erature in the University of Sheffi England, gives what he says are some cases "probably third, fourth, fifth thoughts" about the Dead S Scrolls, but "certainly not l a thoughts." They are, at any rate, v considered, sensible thoughts. Pro sor Bruce remarks dryly that he at le cannot be charged as a "clergym scholar" with reluctance to face implications of the scrolls, because is in fact a "lay teacher in a secu university."

The book begins with an account the discoveries which on the wh simply repeats well-known facts. T minor misstatements may be correc here. Archbishop Samuel did not h his manuscripts over to the Ameri Schools of Oriental Research for th

ears (p. 20); he only allowed them to e photographed and made an agreement permitting the Schools to publish iem within a limit of three years. It as the photographs taken by Trever n Jerusalem, not the scrolls themselves, hich we had to work on from then on. he fragments in the archaic script ound in Cave 1 were not from Deutronomy (p. 27), but from Leviticus, s properly stated on the next page.

Bruce next takes up the relation beween the scrolls and the Old Testanent. He rates rather highly the value f the manuscripts for the reconstruction of the Old Testament text. The evised Standard Version is criticized or not following the two Isaiah manucripts in Isaiah 53:11 and the St. Mark's Isaiah manuscript in 40:12. Noting the curious variety in forms f the text found in the scrolls and ragments from the caves, Bruce conludes with reason that the types of ext represented by the Masoretic (traditional) Hebrew text, the Greek verion (Septuagint), and the Samaritan manuscripts were all alike current among the Jews in general, not the disinctive property of particular sects. The instances of agreement with the Samaritan text in the Qumran fragments, therefore, do not imply that there was any direct contact between the sect of Qumran and the Samaritans. The general result of the study of these texts, Bruce concludes, is to increase our respect for the Masoretic text. With that we may agree, though paradoxically our respect for the Septuagint also is enhanced.

Concerning the identity of persons referred to in the manuscripts Bruce is quite properly cautious. He considers the identification of the Wicked Priest with Alexander Jannaeus the best that has been proposed, but accepts it only tentatively. On this basis he holds that the Teacher of Righteousness probably led a group of Hasidim into the wilderness in the time of Alexander Jannaeus. Some of the Thanksgiving Psalms, he thinks, describe the experiences of the Teacher of Righteousness in the first person. Who the Teacher of Righteousness was, however, cannot be determined. The possibility that he may have been Judah-Gedidiah (so Bruce spells the name) "can only be put as a question" (p. 94). The withdrawal to Damascus is regarded as historical, having perhaps taken place in the reign of Herod. Rather strangely Bruce holds that the earthquake which marks the end of the first period of occupation at Khirbet Qumran took place after the departure of the group, while the building was unoccupied.

Bruce is not entirely satisfied with the theory that the Qumran sectarians were Essenes. He recalls the hints in ancient writings that there were many Messianic and baptist groups in the Jordan valley and the Dead Sea region. The identification of the sect with the "marrying Essenes," however, he accepts tentatively. He maintains that both the texts and the cemetery show that women were admitted to the community, and marriage and family life were not discouraged. If Pliny's account of the Essenes refers to the community of Qumran, therefore, his statement that they were without money and without women is exaggerated.

Several interesting but debatable points of interpretation may be mentioned. The community is said to have believed that it was meant to fulfil the prophetic ideals of the Suffering Servant and the Son of Man. One wonders on what evidence the connection with the Son of Man is based. Bruce maintains, indeed, that the Servant and the Son of Man were originally intended to be the same, Daniel's Son of Man being the Servant himself "under another guise" (p. 103). This is hardly the view of most Old Testament scholars. Bruce rightly denies that there is any Gnosticism, properly speaking, in the texts. More questionable is his speaking of the "great baptisteries" excavated at Khirbet Qumran (p. 106) without even raising the question whether they were really such and not simply cisterns.

Bruce rejects Edmund Wilson's charge that New Testament scholars, unwilling to face the implications of the Dead Sea Scrolls, have neglected them. He protests that the motives of scholars on either side of such a question should not be impugned. He himself finds no unambiguous evidence of any direct connection between the scrolls and Christian origins. Much depends, he says, on the interpretation of the texts. Parallels with the New Testament can be found in the scrolls, as in the Rabbinic literature also. This is not surprising, because the sect and the early church both accepted the same basic biblical revelation. The New Covenant of Qumran was merely a reaffirmation of the Old Covenant. Unlike the Christian church, the Qumran sect still looked forward to a restored temple, a pure sacrificial worship, and the continued service of the Aaronic priesthood.

The supposed parallels which some see between John the Baptist and the Qumran community are denied by Bruce, though he admits that John may have had some contact with the covenanters or people like them. He may even have deliberately deviated from

CLARKE'S COMMENTARY
on the entire Bible

A classic work for all time—books you will use and cherish for a lifetime!

6 big rewarding volumes—beautifully bound

Each volume $4.50
Set $24.50
4,800 Pages

at all bookstores
ABINGDON PRESS

"An excellent study in the origins of American freedom . . ."
—Leonard Verduin in *The Reformed Journal.*

Foundation Of American Freedom

by A. Mervyn Davies

A searching study of America's neglected debt to Calvinism. The author shows how the ideas of Calvin made possible a liberal democracy and the American constitution. $3.50

at all bookstores
Abingdon Press

the teaching and practices of the Qumran group and other Essenes. The Essenes were not such strict ascetics as John the Baptist. It is not impossible that he had been at some time a member of the community, but in the absence of any real evidence this belongs to historical fiction rather than history. Conversely, he "may have been known to many of them," but his preaching did not affect them (p. 108). In any case, his ministry "cannot be brought within an Essene framework" (p. 130).

The ministry of Jesus likewise "caused little if any repercussion at Qumran" (p. 108). Similarities between the Teacher of Righteousness and Jesus are recognized. Both founded new communities. "They both laid down the outlines of a creative method of Biblical interpretation" (p. 96), though Bruce might have added that their methods of interpretation were very different. Both were venerated by their followers, who in both cases used Habakkuk 2:4 to encourage faith in the founder of their own movement. But for the Qumran sect faith did not mean a personal commitment to the Teacher of Righteousness as Lord and Redeemer. Unlike the Qumran sectarians, and unlike John the Baptist, Jesus was not an ascetic. There is no reason to suppose that he ever visited the monastery of Qumran. He lived in Galilee from childhood. The forty days of his fasting and temptation do not allow much time for contact with the Essenes and may not have been spent anywhere near Qumran.

The Teacher of Righteousness was not believed to be the Messiah. Nothing is known of his death; Dupont-Sommer's theory that it was brought about by the Wicked Priest involves a "strained interpretation of the text" (p. 97). John Allegro's inference from the commentary on Nahum that Alexander Jannaeus crucified the Teacher of Righteousness is equally unconvincing. Its reference to "hanging men alive" may mean crucifixion, but there is nothing to show that the Teacher of Righteousness suffered this fate. A writer condemning Alexander Jannaeus might well mention this "supreme barbarity" without implying that the Teacher of Righteousness was one of those who suffered from it. In any case, no atoning value was attached to the death of the Teacher of Righteousness.

That the followers of the Teacher of Righteousness may have expected him to rise from the dead and clear up problems, as others expected Elijah to do, Bruce admits; in fact, he repeats it more than once. The only perceptible reason for it, however, is that the events which were expected had not occurred when the Teacher of Righteousness died. As for his resurrection, "there is no evidence that he did rise from the dead, or that anyone ever thought he had done so" (p. 98).

In a sense that he and his disciples would not have recognized, the Teacher of Righteousness prepared the way for the Messiah. His or his followers' Messianic ideas, however, were very different from those of the Christians. The meaning of the term 'Messiah' was profoundly changed by the life and work of Jesus, who was "different from any kind of Messiah expected at Qumran or elsewhere in Israel in those days" (p. 134). The common three-fold expectation of a prophet, a priest, and a king affords "a point of contact" between Qumran and the Christian church, "which is also a point of cleavage" (p. 79), for whereas the Qumran sect expected three separate persons, Christianity united all three in Christ himself. The Davidic Messiah was expected by the Qumran group to lead the sons of light in the final conflict. "Jesus repudiated this kind of Messiahship" (p. 135). He "rejected the whole conception of such a warfare" (p. 136).

Bruce believes that the covenanters took it as their mission to fulfil the role of the Suffering Servant of the Lord. They did not, however, think of any Messianic figure as fulfilling this role, whereas Jesus took it upon himself to be the Servant. The community itself could not in any case fulfil such a mission adequately by withdrawing from the world. Jesus fulfilled it by being the friend of sinners.

Citing the oft-quoted remark of Renan that Christianity was an Essenism which largely succeeded, Bruce says that Christianity succeeded because it had everything of value in Essenism together with much more. "Christianity owes not only its survival but its very being and character to Jesus" (p. 137). He not only interpreted prophecy, as the Teacher of Righteousness did. but fulfilled it himself.

Bruce has been able to use the most recently published material. He discusses at length the New Testament use or non-use of the three passages from the Old Testament quoted in a docume from Cave 4 which Allegro calls t Florilegium. Of these three, Deuter omy 18:15 is applied to Christ; Nu bers 24:14, though soon adopted Christians as applying to Christ, is n so used in the New Testament; Deut onomy 33 also is not used of Christ the New Testament, the idea of Jes as the true high priest being connect rather with Psalm 110.

The expressions in the Dead S Scrolls which sound to us Johannine a duly noted by Bruce, and he recogniz that their use in the scrolls may sh the background of the Fourth Gos to have been less Hellenistic than h been thought. At the same time emphasizes the new elements in t Johannine use of these terms, quoti Albright with regard to the gulf betwe Essene doctrines and the essentials Johannine teaching. In the practice baptism, the breaking of bread, t rules of fellowship, the community goods, and the form of government the early church, some "analogue with the Qumran sect are seen, b their importance is not found to great. For the church the significan of all these was controlled by the p son and work of Jesus.

To the question what happened to t community of Qumran Bruce replies noting that some of their beliefs a practices reappeared later in su groups as the Mandaeans and the E ionites. He suggests that the deviatio of these groups from New Testame Christianity may have been introduc under the influence of men who ca into them from the Qumran sect af 70 A.D.

The book is written clearly and v orously, with a whimsical touch n and then. Interpretations of the do ments, some of them new, are giv but with very little discussion of p sible alternatives. The presentation enhanced by illustrative excerpts fr the texts themselves, given in the au or's own translations. Not all w have written about the scrolls have be able to do that. Another advanta this book has is that the latest inf mation about the scrolls and the cavations at Khirbet Qumran is cluded. An Epilogue gives facts a even rumors that became known o as the book was going to press, w several additional observations.

Those who look for detailed disc sions or new technical contributio may find this book disappointing. Th

who expect anything radical or sensational will have to look elsewhere, and there are plenty of other discussions that will please them more. Those who wish a brief, sober, reliable account of the scrolls, their contents, and their historical and theological significance will be very well satisfied.

THE DESCENT OF THE DOVE: THE HISTORY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE CHURCH, *By Charles Williams.* 240 pp. New York: Living Age Books, 1956. Paperback, $1.25.

Reviewed by George Harper, Instructor in English, Calvin College.

Charles Williams' *The Descent of the Dove* was first published in England in 1939, and it is now reprinted in paperback form with a helpful introduction by W. H. Auden. The book received little attention from professional theologians when it first appeared, probably because Charles Williams was little known before his death in 1945 — he was not a theologian, but an editor for Oxford University Press who managed to write novels and poetry and literary criticism in his spare time. His reputation, however, has slowly and steadily grown since his death, both as a novelist and as a central figure in the small circle of English literary churchmen that included C.S. Lewis, Dorothy Sayers, and T. S. Eliot.

The Descent of the Dove is the work of an amateur in theology and history, but that does not vitiate the quality of the book. Williams took as his task the relating of the history of "Our Lord the Spirit" in the life of the church, and his erudition in the medieval literature of Europe gives him a range of working which is necessarily closed to, say, K. S. Latourette or Philip Hughes or Foakes-Jackson, for Williams insisted on seeing the work of the Spirit not only in the pronouncements of Councils, the work of strong individuals among the clergy, or general ecclesiastical and theological movements, but also (and at times primarily) in secular literature and thought during periods of great stress throughout Christendom. Consequently, he is at his best when he anatomizes, say, Dante's philosophical poetry or the poetry of the Provencal makers. Consequently, also, he is weak when he attempts to discern the influence of, for example, St. Augustine in the subsequent history of religious *feeling* in the church, especially the post-Reformation church. He was concerned with the incursion of the Holy Spirit in *time* — thus the growth of "courtly love" in the literature of the late Middle Ages is seen as a kind of evidence of the work of the Spirit; likewise, Dante's poetry, especially when it is concerned with Beatrice, is seen as the record of the Holy Spirit's informing beautiful matter so as to counteract the overemphasis in the late Middle Ages on the noumenal, the mystical, in religious experience: "it was the face of the girl in Florence which first startled [Dante] into looking" at "the secret of the universe . . . the ray of Godhead which contains all." Williams goes on to express the wider significance of Dante in this connection: he is seen as both a sensitive perceiver of the operation of the Holy Spirit and at the same time as His agent. This is a line seldom taken in histories of the church, most of which are content to review directly theological and ecclesiastical literature for their data. As Williams puts it, "Our Lord the Spirit . . . has often deigned to instruct the Church by voices without as well as within the Churches."

The Descent of the Dove is a startling book, both because of its style, which is uneven, paradox-ridden, colloquial, at times tiresome, but often downright brilliant, and also because of its method — it is too often a cat's-cradle game played with rather thin historical strings, so that lines are not seen as straight, but rather as intentionally and perhaps capriciously complicated. However, the book provides a further range to the meaning of the Holy Spirit, and the meaning of the church. If it does nothing else, it forces the reader to stop often (and sometimes long) to think about the Holy Spirit as a force even in the secular literary concerns, the life of feeling in its best expression, in the whole of the Christian West from the time of Pentecost to the present. It is an antidote to the bane of the crippling assumption that we have done well by the Holy Spirit when we have mumbled something pious about His presence at certain easily discernible crises in the history of the last 1900 years in and around the church. The book may serve to remind us that our vocabulary may be too limited in this connection too — Williams himself observed, in a neat phrase typical of many in the book, that the "thought of the Middle Ages was not limited, but perhaps its philosophical vocabulary was."

ALL YE THAT LABOR

— Christianity, Communism, and the Problem of Evil

AN AUSPICIOUS START TO EERDMANS NEW **Pathway Books**

by LESTER DeKOSTER, Director of the Library, Calvin College

A brilliant treatment of one of today's most pressing areas of conflict — $1.50

At your bookstore, or Wm. B. EERDMANS PUBLISHING CO.
GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN

Conn Electronic Organs

AMERICA'S FINEST ELECTRONIC ORGAN
FOR CHURCH, CHAPEL, SCHOOL OR HOME

See and hear them at

HERMAN OOSTERHOUSE

Pianos, Organs, High Fidelity Phonographs, Television

1011 KALAMAZOO AVENUE, S.E. GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN

Open Monday, Friday and Saturday Evenings. Phone CH 5-3166

LETTERS TO THE JOURNAL

SIRS:

Will you kindly publish a few remarks pertaining to the article of Dr. Daane on *The Free Offer of the Gospel* in the issue of September 1956? I shall be grateful for your courtesy.

Dr. Daane discusses a pamphlet written by Professors John Murray and Ned B. Stonehouse. The pamphlet has the same title as Dr. Daane's article.

The pamphlet mentioned was distributed free to Christian Reformed ministers and consistories in the spring of 1956. This was done by the Committee on Correspondence of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, of which I am a member, in the interest of better understanding between the two churches. It was sent for no other purpose than for information.

Charges had repeatedly been made that there were those in the ministry of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church who opposed the idea of the free offer of the gospel to all who are addressed by it.

The Committee on Correspondence, consisting of Rev. Robert Marsden, Dr. Ned B. Stonehouse and myself were unanimous in thinking that the pamphlet might clear up possible misunderstanding. There has, so far as my knowledge goes, always been basic agreement between the members of the Faculty of Westminster Seminary on the free offer of the gospel.

This became especially apparent at the time of the Clark controversy. In *The Text of a Complaint,* written at that time and signed among others by Professors Kuiper, Stonehouse, Woolley, Young and myself, the idea of the free offer of the gospel is defended against Clark's views. One sentence of that paper shows this clearly. "In the course of Dr. Clark's examination by Presbytery it became abundantly clear that his rationalism keeps him from doing justice to the precious teaching of Scripture that in the gospel God sincerely offers salvation in Christ to all who hear, reprobate as well as elect, and that he has no pleasure in anyone's rejecting this offer but, contrariwise, would have all who hear accept it and be saved."

Moreover, the content of the Murray-Stonehouse pamphlet was a part of a report dealing in its entirety with Dr. Clark's views. There was no one in the General Assembly, to which the report was made, who did not know that I had signed *The Text of a Complaint* against Clark and that I was in complete sympathy with the report.

What then are we to think when Dr. Daane asserts: "As is well known, there is a radically different view of the free offer of the gospel taught at Westminster Seminary and tolerated by the Orthodox Presbyterian Churches"? We can only say that the exact opposite is true. The whole history of the Clark controversy is there to prove it.

Dr. Daane further says that "it is unmistakably clear that the position of Murray and Stonehouse stands in the theological tradition of the first point of 1924, namely, that the gospel is a genuine, authentic offer of salvation to all who are addressed by it."

This contention is true. And it anew points up the fact that there is basic agreement in the Faculty of Westminster on the matter of the free offer of the gospel. I agreed with Rev. D. Zwier's defense of the first point against the strictures of Dr. K. Schilder (cf. *Common Grace,* p. 26). Dr. Daane mentions with approval the exegesis of Matthew 5:44-48 given by Murray and Stonehouse. "They urge rightly that the gifts of rain and sunshine are not merely good gifts, but that the giving of them expresses a lovingkindness and love within God toward those to whom they are given." Well, it is precisely this point that I defended against Schilder. I argued that we are to do good to the wicked "in imitation of God, whose attitude we may therefore assume to be manifest in His deeds" (*Common Grace,* p. 32; cf. p. 33).

When my views on Common Grace were first attacked by Dr. Masselink I replied by writing *A Letter on Common Grace.* In it the first point of Kalamazoo is again taken up: "There are those who have denied common grace. They have argued, that God *cannot* have any attitude of favor at any stage in history to such as are the 'vessels of wrath'. But to reason thus is to make logic rule over Scriptu Against both Hoeksema and Schilder have therefore contended that we mu think more concretely and analogic ly than they did, allowing ourselves be led only by Scriptural exegesis. We are not to say that God *cannot* ha any attitude of favor to a generality mankind, including both reprobate a elect, because our logic seems to requ us to do so" (pp. 24-25). Once mo in a pamphlet entitled *Particulari and Common Grace,* I discussed t question of God's favor to sinners general. "The fact that the unbeliev who eventually turns out to have be a reprobate adds to his punishment b cause of his misuse of the gifts of ra and sunshine about him is not a pro against the idea that these facts a the gifts of God's favor to him" (p. 1 cf. p. 14).

Still further, in *Common Grace a Witness-Bearing* these words appe "How can God have any attitude favor unto those men whom He ob ously has not included in the numb that could possibly be saved throu the gospel of the blood of Jesus Chris Well, the answer is that we cannot co prehend how it is possible but that t Scriptures reveal it to be true" (p. 1

Again in *The Dilemma of Educati* one may read "So the gospel of sal tion is offered universally. It is offer to mankind. It is offered general It is offered indiscriminately. But it offered conditionally."

Finally, I may refer to *The Presby rian Guardian* of October 15, 1955, 135, in which, addressing new studen I said: "It is the primary or pro work of the Christ to save, not to c demn."

In his book *De Voorzienigheid Go* Dr. G. C. Berkouwer discusses my position to Dr. Schilder with respect the first point of Kalamazoo in th words: "In particular does he opp Schilder's exegesis of Matthew 5 a Luke 6" (p. 89). "Quite rightly V Til has fully maintained the connecti between the long-suffering and maintenance [of the unrighteous] a he charged Hoeksema with not taki into consideration the element of ti He who does not do this will reas

eductively from the doctrines of election and reprobation and conclude that here never *can* proceed from God any wrath against believers. Over against this Van Til remarks, in genuine biblical fashion [*echt bybels*] that through the fall the elect became *sinners* and as such objects of God's wrath" (p. 90).

Berkouwer here places his finger on the important point of method. It has been my concern in the five booklets mentioned to stress the point that we cannot start from certain doctrines like election and reprobation and reason deductively from them. We must recognize the facts that as creatures of God our "systems" will be analogical systems. Berkouwer noted this fact and approved of it. And it is a well-known fact that at Westminster Seminary there is basic agreement on this question of methodology. And this agreement on methodology no doubt accounts, in large measure, for the basic agreement that obtains in the Faculty on the free offer of the gospel.

Even Dr. S. J. Ridderbos, who disagrees with me on some aspects of the question of common grace, nonetheless says: "Common grace as a favorable *attitude* of God is splendidly maintained by Van Til."

When in the course of the past summer a minister of the Christian Reformed Church wrote me a letter asking whether I was in agreement with the three points of Kalamazoo I replied in the affirmative. When he also asked whether I was in essential agreement with the Murray-Stonehouse pamphlet on *The Free Offer of the Gospel* I again answered in the affirmative. Anyone who wishes can discover from what I have written that my replies were not born of the moment but represent a long-standing conviction.

Last month I received a letter from someone who said: "I have been told that you in your theology have almost no place for the doctrine of common grace, save in name alone — and then applying it to the whole of mankind, not the individual. Also I have been told that you do not support the three articles of 1924. Again, I have been told that you maintain that God delights in the death of the wicked. I have been told that your thinking leaves little room for a warm-hearted gospel appeal to the unconverted. I have been told that your system is cold and hard."

In conjunction with my reply to this person I sent him a copy of each of the five booklets mentioned, requesting that he judge for himself. I deeply appreciate this party's willingness to read what I have written before believing such utterly false reports about my views. If any interested reader will do as much as this person I shall be deeply grateful. I shall be glad to help him as far as I can by sending him the same materials for the purpose. My colleagues on the Faculty, the Board of the Seminary and the General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church would not, I think and hope, tolerate me in their midst if I held views in any serious way at variance with those expressed in the Murray-Stonehouse pamphlet. It was sent out on the assumption of basic agreement.

Sincerely yours,

C. Van Til

Philadelphia, Pa.

REPLY

It is gratifying to read that Dr. Van Til agrees with the position of Professors Murray and Stonehouse, and also with my judgment that their position is in the tradition of the Three Points of 1924. It is also gratifying to see Van Til declare that he himself agrees with the Three Points. This is particularly gratifying because he has never explicitly related his theology of common grace to the position of 1924, and until now, to my best knowledge, has never before declared in print his agreement with the Three Points.

On occasion Dr. Van Til has expressed disagreement with certain criticisms made against the Three Points. This did not, however, prove agreement, but only that he regarded certain criticisms of the Three Points as invalid. Now that we have his explicit statement of agreement with the Three Points he would render a real service if he would seek to show how his position can be harmonized with that of 1924. How, for example, would he reconcile with the position of 1924 his definition of common grace as exclusively "earlier grace," his definition of man as *undifferentiated generality* and a *differentiated, individuated sinner*, and his contention that there is grace for man as a generality but *not* for man as a differentiated individual sinner? And, for that matter, how reconcile all this with the position of Murray and Stonehouse? A mere verbal assertion of agreement is not enough. Surely it must be plain to all who know the Three Points, that these Points know nothing of a grace which is merely earlier grace, know nothing of a definition of man in terms of Van Til's limiting concepts, and know nothing of a grace which is real and meaningful for man *only before* he exists *as* an individual sinner. Nor does 1924 know anything of a general gospel offer which is meaningful for man only before he exists as an individual sinner. On the contrary, both 1924 and Murray and Stonehouse teach a common grace and a gracious gospel offer which is well-meant and meaningful to individual men in their very reality as existent individual sinners. How is this position that there is grace for man *as sinner*, for *the existing individual sinner* as he confronts us in life, to be reconciled with Van Til's position that there is grace and a gracious gospel offer only for man before he exists as a differentiated and individual sinner?

Van Til now states openly that he agrees with 1924. Has he changed his position? In his *Common Grace* (1947) pp. 82, 83) he contended that the greatest amount of common grace existed in pre-Fall *sinless* history, and that as differentiated, individual sinners emerged out of mankind as a generality, common grace progressively decreased. But later in his *The Defense of the Faith* (1955, p. 403) he admitted that strictly speaking we can only speak of grace in reference to *sinful* history and *sinful* men. This is a basic change in his

FOLDING BANQUET TABLES AND CHAIRS

Table Trucks — Chair Trucks

No knee interference for safer and more efficient use.

Low direct factory prices to churches and institutions

REINDERS MFG. CO.

215 W. Nebraska St. Algona, Iowa

conception of grace. It is a return to the traditional position, the position of 1924, the position which allowed 1924 to teach that there is grace for men *as sinners*, grace for sinners *as such*.

If Van Til would now take seriously the conception of grace he himself urges in his *The Defense of the Faith*, he would have no theological reason whatever for continuing to hold to his old position, found throughout his writings and especially in his *Common Grace*, the position namely, that there is no grace for differentiated, existent, individual sinners, for sinners *as sinners*. If indeed one can speak about grace concretely and meaningfully only when one sees it as related to the concrete sinful situation of sinful men in sinful history, as Van Til now admits, then there is no reason for saying that the gospel offer has meaning for man only when he merely exists as elect or reprobate in the mind of God, or as a "sinner" in quotation marks. On the contrary, there would be good theological reason for Van Til to declare with 1924 that there is grace for men *as sinners*, for men *as reprobates*, for men *as epistemologically self-conscious*, and also, with 1924, to declare that there is a gracious gospel offer not merely for mankind as a class, but for individual sinners *as sinners*.

There is nothing new in any of the quotations Van Til presents above. He simply quotes his writings, writings which provide us with his own interpretation of the gospel offer. He teaches: "The general presentation comes to a generality. It comes to 'sinners', differentiated, to be sure, as elect and reprobate in the mind of God, but yet, prior to their act of acceptance or rejection, regarded as a generality" (*Common Grace*, p. 76). Again, "The general offer has meaning only with respect to those who are at an earlier stage of history. It has meaning with respect to the elect and reprobate when they are, and to the extent that they are, members of an as yet undifferentiated generality" (*Ibid.*, p. 81). And to mention no more. "The offer or presentation is not to those who believe any more than to those who disbelieve. The offer comes to those who have so far neither believed nor disbelieved. It comes before that differentiation has taken place" (*Ibid.*, p. 78). Van Til's gospel offer, therefore, by his own statement, has no reality for, and no meaning for, individual men as *real* sinners (without quotation marks!), but is real and meaningful only before they exist as unbelievers, *et cetera*. This is wholly in harmony with what he says about common grace in general: "the attitude of favor spoken of is in no sense directed toward man's evil nature as such" (*Ibid.*, p. 91).

Here is the crux of the matter. Here is my basic criticism of Van Til's conception of grace. It is, he says, "in no sense directed towards man's evil nature as such"! There is no favor of God to man *as sinner*. When, as he indicates in his letter, Van Til meets the objector to common grace who says, God *cannot* have any attitude of favor at any stage in history to such as are "vessels of wrath," then Van Til answers that "the answer is that we cannot comprehend how it is possible but that the Scriptures reveal it to be true." But what, according to Van Til, does the Scripture reveal to be true? This: there is a favor or grace of God for "vessels of wrath," but not when they exist *as such*. For the attitude of favor spoken of is *in no sense* directed toward man's evil nature *as such!* The "vessels of wrath" enjoy God's favor, says Van Til, only at an earlier stage of history, *i.e.*, when they are not yet sinful vessels of wrath — for the favor spoken of is in no sense directed toward the vessel of wrath *as such!*

Therefore when Van Til says that he believes in a general offer of the gospel, he believes in a kind of gospel offer which is not an offer to the unbeliever *as unbeliever*, to the sinner *as such*. In his view, the favor of God whether expressed through rain and sunshine or through the gospel offer in no sense extends to the unbeliever *as such*, to the sinner *as sinner*. I ask the reader, Is this the kind of grace and the kind of gracious offer of the gospel taught by the Three Points? Is it grace at all? Is not biblical grace, whether common or special, directed to the sinner precisely as an evil-natured sinner?

Or does the sinner have a nature other than his sinful, evil nature, which is then the object of God's favor and the gospel offer? No doubt the reader will answer, No. Yet this question concerning Van Til's thought is not po less, for as will be indicated bel ordinary morality and civic righteo ness, according to Van Til, is not product of common grace but is p duced by the release of the unregen ate's moral powers.

The same insistence that grace is for man as sinner is seen in Van T interpretation of Matt. 5:44-48. Agai Schilder, Van Til says, "I argued t we are to do good to the wicked imitation of God.' " Van Til tells us w it means to imitate God (*Comm Grace* pp. 84, 85). Rain and sunshi says Van Til, is an expression of b divine grace and divine wrath. H the idea of wrath is obtained *from passage* is not indicated. In fact, h ever, it is obtained by Van Til's sistence that we must interpret the p sage in terms of the limiting conc "mankind in general." He urges, " are to think of non-believers as me bers of the mass of humankind in wh the process of differentiation has yet been completed." We must member this when expressing our l to the unbeliever because "It is to the righteous and to the unrighte as fully differentiated that God gi His rain and sunshine." Therefo says Van Til, "We are to give 'rain and sunshine' as God gives the on the basis of the mass of mankin Here we are told that we are to exte love and favor to men only in the gree which corresponds to the deg in which they are *not yet unrighteo* because God so extends his favor. deed, Van Til spotlights his insiste that there is no grace for man as sinn Using the antichrist as an illustrati he urges that the extension of grace man *as a sinner* (*i.e.*, in so far as he a historically finished product) wo be "to cast pearls before swine" (p. 8

Van Til's argument that "we are do good to the wicked 'in imitation God' " when viewed in the light of own interpretation does not mean t in Van Til's thought God has gra and a gracious gospel-offer for men sinners. At this crucial point his po tion is quite different from that 1924, and also quite different fr that of Murray and Stonehouse who their interpretation of Matt. 5 urge t God extends lovingkindness to sinn in their "ungodly state" (*The F Offer of the Gospel*, p. 7).

Van Til has now expressed his agreement with all of the Three Points of 1924. In my *A Theology of Grace* I have considered Van Til's theology as it relates to the Second and Third Points and made the judgment that his theology is not in agreement with either of these. None of that need be repeated here. Since the writing of my book, however, Van Til's *A Letter On Common Grace* appeared. In this Letter, and in a context which refers to the Three Points of 1924, Van Til explicitly denies that the unregenerate's "sense of morality" is the result of common grace (p. 16). Later, in the same Letter, he urges that the unregenerate's moral good or civic righteousness is the result of "a release within him of his moral powers" (p. 37). I leave it to the reader who knows the Three Points to judge whether one can hold this position and at the same time express agreement with the teaching of the Christian Reformed Synod of 1924.

I conclude as I began. Dr. Van Til would render a valuable service if he would in his writings show us how his position on common grace and on the general offer of the gospel relates to, and can be harmonized with, 1924, and with that of Murray and Stonehouse. If it can be done, I will be among the first to acknowledge it.

—JAMES DAANE

SIRS:

In the May and June 1956 issues appeared an excellent article by the Reverend H. Schultze on "Education and the Seminary." The article is most interesting and at the same time sadly enlightening. "Sadly" because the responsibility for the inadequate preparation of the students rests in the end upon the shoulders of every one of us, the church members.

Indeed, we are giving full attention to all our earthly needs. In our business activities we pour heart and soul into the race to keep abreast of the times; we labor day and night in order to remain modern and up to date. We compel our universities to review and/or revise their curricula at least once per year (often twice) in order that the education shall anticipate the needs; and unless so done, we simply refrain from availing ourselves of the services of such a university. The ensuing cultural and technological progress has made life more complex, has greatly increased job requirements, and has made education very extensive.

Not having given such considerations to the Seminary, we now find that, as Reverend Schultze expresses it, our students are unable "to meet wisely all the problems they are expected to meet." Or, as the title of the article points out: "education" and "seminary" have become different concepts. So different, that beyond the classrooms of the Seminary there exists a gap, a vacuum. And thus in effect we are turning out prospective ministers who are under-educated and under-trained.

It appears inevitable to agree with Reverend Schultze's discussion of the situation, and one can only appreciate his gentle way of bringing it to our attention. However, I cannot agree with the concluding recommendation: that the Church undertake a thorough study of the matter, and require another year of training in the form of practical field work. It seems to me that "thorough" and "matter" leave room for interpretation. It should be clear to us that we are preparing men for top-executive positions (Presidents of religious Corporations) in the *King's Business*. The same Lord and King Whom on Sunday we profess to love with all our heart, strength and mind. Which means that we should give the training of God's Representatives *at least* as much attention, and use in their education at least as much of our talents, as for our earthly corporation executives. Consequently we should make a complete analysis of the problem, and a complete analysis of each of the "multifarious duties" in the periphery of the minister's work, and its need. After establishing the needs, the facilities and program for training can be determined.

Considering the enormous mass of knowledge that must be acquired for any present-day executive position, Reverend Schultze may remark that Calvin might be unable to provide the proper facilities, and that we will have to provide education beyond the graduate level; which also must take care of after-school needs. But if we *need* such facilities, namely a university, what could prevent us from carrying out such plans?

The more one thinks about the subject of education for the ministry, the more one disagrees with the recommendation to study the matter and require another year of training in field work. If it is desired that our ministers are able to serve in their calling with intelligence and with relevance to the social situation in which we all live, then the scope of the problem is much wider. It encompasses the parents who rear the students. It is vitally affected by the needs of each phase of the work itself. It includes an analysis of many factors that may remain hidden in a superficial consideration. It includes the searching of much more soul than we perhaps like to admit.

To merely slap a year of practical training on top of the present system is patch work. In the Lord's Business (if we can help it) we should execute no patch work. In the Lord's Business we should use all talents, of ourselves and of all creation, with all our heart, with all our strength, and with all our mind. It applies to our educating His Representatives too.

Very truly yours,

JOHN INGWERSEN.

Folcroft, Penna.

Monroe
FOLDING
BANQUET
TABLES
Direct Prices & Discounts to Churches, Schools, Clubs, Lodges and All Organizations
COMPLETE CATALOG ON REQUEST
MONROE TRUCKS
For handling and storing folding tables and chairs. The easy, modern way. Choice of models.
PORTABLE PARTITIONS
Change your idle space into useful areas with these Partitions. Masonite panels in tubular steel frames with swivel action pedestals and casters or glides.
FOLDING CHAIRS
Steel built, sturdy, convenient.
THE Monroe COMPANY
154 Church St. Colfax, Iowa

INDEXES TO VOLUME VI

1956 Index of Articles

Admission Into the Church (May, H. Stob)
Admission Into the Church (June, J. Daane)
Admission Into the Church — Right or Favor? (Apr., J. Daane)
Age of Science, The (Oct., T. P. Dirkse)
Apostate from Reformed Principles? (May, L. Verduin)
Bavinck Points the Way (Mar., B. Kruithof)
Bode, Cornelius (Mar., J. G. Vanden Bosch)
Cecil De Boer
  The Journalist (Jan., H. Zylstra)
  The Man (Jan., J. De Boer)
  The Philosopher (Jan., H. Stob)
  The Teacher (Jan., F. Van Halsema)
Christian and the World According to Bavinck, The (Oct., B. Kruithof)
Church and Current Social Trends, The (Feb., D. H. Bouma)
Church and Divorce, The (Apr., G. Stob)
Church and Old Testament History, The (Jul-Aug., C. Kromminga)
Church With An Open Door, The (Mar., J. D. Eppinga)
College Teaching (Apr., L. J. Flokstra)
Denominationalism (Nov., J. Daane)
Do We Dare to Use Modern English? (Sept., J. J. Lamberts)
Echoes (Jan., C. De Boer)
Education and the Seminary (May, H. Schultze)
Effective College Teaching (Mar., L. J. Flokstra)
Elder at Classis, The (June, W. Boer)
Examination of Candidates for the Ministry (May, H. Verduin)
Fall of Three Houses, The (Nov., C. F. Otten)
Five Travellers (May, J. Timmerman)
Free Offer of the Gospel, The (Sept., J. Daane)
From Atheism to Christianity (Mar., H. Zylstra)
Foundation of American Freedom, The (Sept., L. Verduin)
Genesis and Science in John Calvin (Mar., D. Jellema)
Growing Pains (Feb., H. B. Spaan)
Heritage and Destiny (Dec., M. E. Osterhaven)
Hospitality (Dec., H. Zylstra)
Interpreting Old Testament History (Apr., C. Kromminga)
Introducing Okke Jager (Oct., J. Vriend)
Invitation to Thanksgiving, An (Nov., J. Daane)
Labor Problem, The (Nov., G. Stob)
Logic of Faith, The (Jan., C. De Boer)
Love in the Spring (June, C. J. Miller)
Nationalism and Christian Missions (July-Aug., E. H. Smit
Nigeria (May, H. R. Boer)
Nigeriana (Oct., H. R. Boer)
On the Ius Reformandi (Feb., L. Verduin)
Open Door for All Sinners (Jul.-Aug., G. Stob)
Opportunities for Scholarship (Jul.-Aug., D. Jellema)
Our Penitence Problem (Feb., W. P. Brink)
Pages From the Past (June, Jul.-Aug., Sept., Oct., De
  The Editors)
Primacy of the Intellect: Greek or Christian, The? (Ma
  A. A. Hoekema)
Primacy of the Intellect: A Tenable Concept, The? (Ju
  A. A. Hoekema)
Reformed Faith and the Near East, The (Feb., B. M. Madan
"Reluctantly Endured" (Jan., E. Bossenbroek)
Schepers, John (Jul.-Aug., J. G. Vanden Bosch)
Seminary Internship (June, H. Schultze)
Synod of 1956, The (Jul.-Aug., J. Daane)
Synod 1956 on the Labor Question (Sept., G. Stob)
To Any Writer at Calvin College (Oct., S. J. Van der Weel
Toward a Calvin University (Jan., W. H. Jellema)
Toward a Sober Typology (June, C. Kromminga)
Toward a Theistic Creationism (Oct., L. Verduin)
Toward a Theistic Creationism II (Nov., L. Verduin)
Two Centennial Thoughts (June, L. B. Smedes)
When Abraham Saw the Day of Christ (Dec., J. Weidenaa
When the Lord Adds . . . (Mar., J. Daane)
World Unbent? (Apr., L. De Koster)

1956 Index of Book Reviews

Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls, by F. F. Bru
  (Dec.)
Surprised by Joy, by C. S. Lewis (Mar.)
The Bent World, by J. V. L. Casserly (Apr.)
The Descent of the Dove, by C. Williams (Dec.)
The Foundation of American Freedom, by A. M. Davi
  (Sept.)
The Nun's Story, by Kathryn Hulme (Dec.)

1956 Index of Authors

Boer, Harry R. (May, Oct.)
Boer, William (June)
Bossenbroek, Edward (Jan.)
Bouma, Donald (Feb.)
Brink, William P. (Feb.)
Burrows, M. (Dec.)
Daane, James (Mar., Apr., June, July-Aug., Sept., Nov.)
De Boer, Cecil (Jan.)
De Boer, Jesse (Jan.)
De Koster, Lester (Apr.)
Dirkse, T. P. (Oct.)
Editors, The (June, July-Aug., Sept., Oct., Dec.)
Eppinga, J. D. (Mar.)
Flokstra, Lambert J. (Mar., Apr.)
Harper, G. G. (Dec.)
Hoekzema, Anthony A. (May, June)
Jellema, Dirk W. (Mar., July-Aug.)
Jellema, W. Harry (Jan.)
Kromminga, Carl (Apr., June, July-Aug.)
Kruithof, Bastian (Mar., Oct.)
Lamberts, J. J. (Sept.)
Madany, B. M. (Feb.)
Miller, Charles J. (June)
Osterhaven, M. E. (Dec.)
Otten, A. (Dec..)
Otten, Charlotte F. (Nov.)
Schultze, Henry (May, June)
Smedes, Lewis B. (June)
Smith, Edgar H. (July-Aug.)
Spaan, Howard B. (Feb.)
Stob, George (Apr., July-Aug., Sept., Nov.)
Stob, Henry (Jan., May)
Timmerman, John (May)
Vanden Bosch, J. G. (Mar., July-Aug.)
Van der Weele, Steve J. (Oct.)
Van Halsema, F. (Jan.)
Verduin, Henry (May)
Verduin, Leonard (Feb., May, Sept., Oct., Nov.)
Vriend, John (Oct.)
Weidenaar, J. (Dec.)
Zylstra, Henry (Jan., Mar., Dec.)

1956 Letters to the Journal

Daane, J. (Dec.)
Dahm, J. J. (Jan.)
DeBoer, A. (Jul.-Aug.)
DeHaan, R. (Jan.)
De Vries, G. (Jan.)
Feringa, P. J. (June)
Groenewald, E. P. (June)
Haan, B. J., (Sept.)
Haan, B. T. (Jul.-Aug.)
Handley, V. (May)
Harper, G. G. (Jul.-Aug.)
Ingwersen, J. (Dec.)
Kort., D. (Mar.)
Mills, R. (Oct.)
Nyenhuis, J. E. (Nov.)
Oppewal, D. (June)
Osterhaven, M. E. (Mar.)
Peters, L. (Mar.)
Sietsema, J. H. (Jan.)
Tiemersma, R. R. (Apr.)
Van Andel, H. J. (May, June, Oct.)
Van Dyken, P. L. (May, Sept.)
Van Ens, C. (Oct.)
Van Til, C. (Dec.)
Vander Weele, S. (Apr.)
Veenstra, C. R. (Jul.-Aug.)
Welmers, W. E. (Nov.)
Zwiep, M. (Feb.)

1956 Index of Advertisers

Abingdon Press (Mar., Sept., Oct., No
  Dec.)
B. B. Kirkbride Bible Co. (Sept., No
Baker Book House (Mar., Apr., Ma
  Oct.)
Christianity Today (Jul.-Aug.)
H. H. Halley (Mar., Apr., May, Ju
  Jul.-Aug., Sept.)
Herman Oosterhouse (Oct., Nov., De
John Knox Press (Nov.)
M. Horjus (Mar.)
Markilo (Mar., Apr., May, June, Ju
  Aug., Sept.)
Preferred Risk Mutual Insurance
  (Mar., May, June, Sept.)
Record Library Society (Mar., Ap
  May, June, Jul.-Aug., Sept.)
Reinders Mfg. Co. (Mar., Apr., Ma
  June, Jul.-Aug., Sept., Nov., Dec
The Monroe Co. (June, Jul.-Aug., Se
  Oct., Nov., Dec.)
Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. (Ma
  May, June, Jul.-Aug., Sept., O
  Nov., Dec.)